

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

ANTHONY TRUPIA,

Plaintiff,

v.

HERITAGE HARD ASSETS LLC, et al.

Defendants.

Case No. CIV-24-498-SLP

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendant Telnix, LLC’s Second Motion for Extension of Time to Answer or Otherwise Respond [Doc. No. 38]. Defendant seeks a second extension of time, premised on the filing of Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand. *See* Mot. at 1 (stating that “[t]he Court previously granted another Defendant’s Motion for Extension of time to the later of either June 26, 2024, or fourteen days after the Court’s decision on the Motion to Remand” and requesting similar relief “so the parties can focus on addressing the issues raised in Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand”).¹ The Court, however, has stricken the Motion to Remand and therefore, any request for an extension of time tied to the filing of that Motion is DENIED.


¹ Defendant references the Court’s Order [Doc. No. 24], granting Defendant Onvoy, LLC an extension of time until June 26, 2024 or fourteen days after the Court rules on any motion for remand that may be filed by Plaintiff, whichever is later, within which to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff’s Complaint. *See id.*

The Court will, however, grant Defendant Telnix, LLC an extension of time to respond to the Complaint commensurate with that granted to Defendant Zebersky Payne Shaw Lewenz LLP, or until June 27, 2024. *See* Order [Doc. No. 32].

The Court takes this opportunity to admonish all parties that in future filings before the Court, strict compliance with LCvR 7.1(h)(4) will be required as to any requests for an extension of time. The movant must affirmatively state “whether the opposing counsel or party agrees or objects to the requested extension.” To this end, attempts to have contacted the opposing counsel or party will not suffice. The parties are expected to conduct themselves in good faith and to promptly respond to any contact by the opposing counsel or party made for the purpose of complying with LCvR 7.1(h)(4). Any request for an extension of time that does not comply with LCvR 7.1(h)(4) will be summarily stricken.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant Telnix, LLC’s Second Motion for Extension of Time to Answer or Otherwise Respond [Doc. No. 38] is GRANTED IN PART. Defendant Telnix LLC shall answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff’s Complaint on or before June 27, 2004.²

IT IS SO ORDERED this 14th day of June, 2024.


SCOTT L. PALK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² If Plaintiff refiles a motion to remand, Defendant may seek any additional relief at that time, as may be warranted.